

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
SOUTHERN DIVISION

JESSE WHITE and KIMBERLY
WHITE,

Plaintiffs,

v.

MORTGAGE ELECTRONIC
REGISTRATION SYSTEMS, INC.,

Case No. 2:21-mc-50732

Paul D. Borman
United States District Judge

Defendant.

**ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFFS' PETITION FOR RECONSIDERATION
OF ORDER DENYING REQUEST FOR PERMISSION TO FILE NEW
CIVIL ACTION AND DISMISSING CASE (ECF NO. 4)**

On May 10, 2021, Plaintiffs Jesse and Kimberly White filed a request to file a complaint against Mortgage Electronic Registration Systems, Inc. relating to the 2004 foreclosure of their property. (ECF No. 1.) Plaintiffs “are enjoined and restrained from filing in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan any new lawsuit against any party relating in any way to real property they own, or owned previously, without first making a written request for and receiving a court order from the Presiding Judge authorizing the filing of such suit.” (See *White v. MERS*, Case No. 16-cv-11514, ECF No. 18, Opinion and Order (Feb. 17, 2017) (Goldsmith, J.).)

On June 4, 2021, after careful review of Plaintiffs' submission in this case, the Court denied Plaintiffs' request because it was nearly identical to the more than ten previous lawsuits they filed in this District related to the 2004 foreclosure of their home, and dismissed their case. (ECF No. 3.)

On June 14, 2021, Plaintiffs filed a Petition for Reconsideration of the Court's June 4, 2021 Order. (ECF No. 4). Local Rule 7.1 allows a party to file a motion for reconsideration. E.D. Mich. L.R. § 7.1(g). However, a motion for reconsideration which presents the same issues already ruled upon by the court, either expressly or by reasonable implication, will not be granted. *Whitehouse Condo. Grp., LLC v. Cincinnati Ins. Co.*, 959 F. Supp. 2d 1024, 1031 (E.D. Mich. 2013). A motion for reconsideration should be granted if the movant demonstrates a palpable defect by which the court and the parties have been misled and that a different disposition of the case must result from a correction thereof. *See MCI Telecommunications Corp. v. Michigan Bell Telephone Co.*, 79 F. Supp. 2d 768, 797 (E.D. Mich. 1999).

As this Court previously found, the proposed suit would not differ from the multiple previous lawsuits that Plaintiffs have filed in this district relating to the 2004 foreclosure of their home, all of which have been dismissed or otherwise resolved against Plaintiffs. Plaintiffs have failed to identify a "palpable defect" by which the Court has been misled, and Plaintiff's petition for reconsideration

therefore is DENIED.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: July 8, 2021

s/Paul D. Borman

Paul D. Borman

United States District Judge